



counterclaims of infringement of the '747 patent is in the interest of judicial efficiency. Namely, the counterclaims relating to infringement of the '747 patent involve the same parties and the same accused products as the original counterclaims for infringement of the '894 patent. Further, since Plaintiffs have yet completed their discovery obligations, adding the '747 patent at this stage will not prejudice Plaintiffs. Moreover, Hillman believes that the addition of the '747 patent will not cause the parties to repeat any discovery that has been taken thus far.

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a), "leave shall be freely given when justice so requires." The Sixth Circuit employs the following factors in determining whether to grant leave: "undue delay in filing, lack of notice to the opposing party, bad faith by the moving party, repeated failure to cure deficiencies by previous amendment, undue prejudice to the opposing party, and futility of the amendment." *Seals. v. General Motors Corp.*, 546 F.3d 766, 770 (6th Cir. 2008) (citing *Wade v. Knoxville Utils. Bd.*, 259 F.3d 452, 459 (6th Cir. 2001)).

The above-listed factors are either neutral or weigh in favor of the Court granting Hillman's motion for leave to file the Second Amended Complaint. For example, this amendment is being filed prior to the deadline to amend pleadings, and thus, there is no undue delay in the filing of the Second Amended Answer. In addition, Hillman believes that Plaintiffs have been aware of the '747 patent, and therefore, there is sufficient notice to Plaintiffs. Further, because discovery is still ongoing and infringement of the '747 patent involves the same accused devices, Plaintiffs will not suffer undue prejudice and the parties and this Court may recognize efficiencies by resolving infringement of the '747 patent in this action.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Hillman respectfully requests that the Court grant Hillman leave to file the attached Second Amended Answer to include counterclaims against Plaintiffs for infringement of the '747 patent. Hillman believes that the Court may wish to

modify certain aspects of the current procedural schedule in this action as a result of the Second Amended Answer. Hillman will consult with Plaintiffs on these scheduling matters with the objective of filing a joint motion concerning any proposed scheduling changes.

Dated: April 30, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Daniel F. Gourash

Daniel F. Gourash, Esq. (0032413)  
SEELEY, SAVIDGE, EBERT & GOURASH  
CO., LPA  
26600 Detroit Road  
Cleveland, Ohio 44145-2397  
Tel: 216.566.8200  
Fax: 216.566.0213

and

Christopher P. Isaac, Esq. (VA Bar No. 27801)  
Judy W. Chung, Esq. (VA Bar No. 74760)  
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER LLP  
Two Freedom Square  
11955 Freedom Drive  
Reston, Virginia 20190-5675  
Tel: 571.203.2700  
Fax: 202.408.4400

*Attorneys for Defendant  
The Hillman Group, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing HILLMAN'S MOTION TO FILE SECOND AMENDED ANSWER INCLUDING ADDITIONAL COUNTERCLAIMS OF INFRINGEMENT AGAINST PLAINTIFFS *INSTANTER* was filed electronically on this 30<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2009. Parties will receive notice through the Court's electronic filing system.

/s/ Daniel F. Gourash

One of the Attorneys for Defendant  
The Hillman Group, Inc.